

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action dated June 13, 2007.

Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhou (2003/0003973), in view of Farazmandnia (6,625,472) and in further view of Cannon (WO/9417502). Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 has been amended to change “main CPU” to “--main controller--” and “sub CPU” to “--sub controller--” in order to make the claim terminology internally consistent and consistent with the other claims.

Independent claim 1 provides for, “[a] power supply control method in a portable communication device provided with a plurality of controllers including a main controller and a sub controller for controlling external communication, the external communication including wired communication through an external connector in the portable communication device and radio communication for location registration of the portable communication device, the power supply control method comprising the steps of: a) checking whether the sub controller is controlling the external communication; and b) when the external communication has not been controlled for a predetermined time-out period, powering off the sub controller,” (emphasis supplied).

Independent claim 6 provides, in part, for, “[a] power supply control system in a portable communication device provided with a plurality of controllers including a main controller and a sub controller for controlling external communication, the external communication including wired communication through an external connector in the portable communication device and radio communication for location registration of the portable communication device, the power supply control system comprising: ... power control means controlling power supply of the sub controller such that the sub controller is powered off when the external communication has not been controlled for a predetermined time-out period,” (emphasis supplied).

Independent claim 9 provides, in part, for, “[a] portable communication device comprising: ... an external connector; a sub controller for controlling external communication, the external communication including wired communication through the external connector and radio

communication for location registration of the portable communication device ... and power control means controlling power supply of the sub controller such that the sub controller is powered off when the external communication has not been controlled for a predetermined time-out period ...,” (emphasis supplied).

Independent claim 10 provides for, “[a] computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program instructing a computer to implement a power supply control method in a portable communication device provided with a plurality of controllers including a main controller and a sub controller for controlling external communication, the external communication including wired communication through an external connector in the portable communication device and radio communication for location registration of the portable communication device, the program comprising the steps of: a) checking whether the sub controller is controlling the external communication; and b) when the external communication has not been controlled for a predetermined time-out period, powering off the sub controller,” (emphasis supplied).

Independent claims 1, 6, 9, and 10 provide that the sub controller is powered off when the external communication has not been controlled for a predetermined time-out period. Furthermore, independent claims 1, 6, 9, and 10 provide that the external communication includes wire communication through the external connector and radio communication for location registration of the portable communication device. Therefore, independent claims 1, 6, 9, and 10 require that sub controller be powered off when wire communication through an external connector in the portable communication device and radio communication for location registration of the portable communication device have not been controlled for a predetermined time-out period.

The Examiner admits, with regard to independent claims 1, 6, 9, and 10 that “Zhou lacks a teaching of the external communication including wired communication through an external connector,” (Office Action, page 3, lines 16-17; page 5, lines 15-16; page 8, lines 1-2; page 9, lines 13-14). The Examiner contends, however, that, “Farazmandnia teaches a portable cellular device being able to communicate via a wire communication through an external connector,” (Office Action, page 3, lines 17-19; page 5, lines 16-18; page 8, lines 2-4; page 9, lines 14-16).

However, Farazmandnia does not teach, disclose, or suggest the powering off of the sub controller if the wire communication through an external connector in the portable communication device has not been controlled by the sub controller for a predetermined time-out period, as required by independent claims 1, 6, 9, and 10.

With regard to independent claims 1 and 6, the Examiner admits that “Zhou et al. do not disclose a predetermined time-out period,” (Office Action, page 3, line 5; page 5, line 4). With regard to independent claim 9, the Examiner similarly admits that “Zhou et al. do not disclose wherein the main CPU implements a predetermined time-out period,” (Office Action, page 7, lines 4-5). With regard to independent claim 10, the Examiner also admits that “Zhou et al. do not disclose adjusting the power when the external communication has not been controlled for a predetermined time-out period,” (Office Action, page 8, lines 19-20).

The Examiner, however, contends that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a predetermined time-out period, as taught by Cannon, in the method of Zhou et al. in order to respond to a need to communicate with the external device during the predetermined time-out period and disconnect power when the time-out period expires in order to save power, (Office Action, page 3, lines 6-11; page 5, lines 5-10; page 7, lines 12-18; page 9, lines 3-8).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s reasoning regarding combining Cannon with Zhou et al. The Examiner evidently understands a need to communicate with an external device during the predetermined time-out period and disconnect the power when the time-out period expires in order to save power. Since the relevant disconnection in Zhou appears to be a disconnection of power to the cellular radio device 3, (see Office Action, page 2, paragraph 3, line 6, and page 4, line 14, wherein the cellular radio device of Zhou is equated to the sub controller of claims 1 and 6; see also abstract), the Examiner is apparently indicating that there is a need to communicate with an external device during a predetermined time-out period and then to disconnect power to the cellular radio device after the predetermined time-out period expires.

However, such a need is respectfully submitted by the Applicant not to exist. When the portable terminal 1 is located within an area of a radio calling system, the portable terminal 1 performs location registration to the radio calling system through the cellular system, disconnects power to the cellular radio device 3, and enters the radio calling standby state, (abstract, lines 5-10).

There is no need, and, indeed, it may interfere with the operation of the device of Zhou, to communicate with an external device for a predetermined time-out period and then to disconnect power to the cellular radio device 3. As previously pointed out, when the portable terminal 1 is located within an area of a radio calling system, the portable terminal 1 performs location registration to the radio calling system through the cellular system, (abstract, lines 5-8). It performs this location registration by means of the cellular radio device 3, (paragraph [0046], lines 1-5). Thus, power must be supplied to the cellular radio device 3 for as long as the portable terminal 1 performs location registration to the radio calling system through the cellular system. Any predetermined time-out period after which power to the cellular radio device 3 is disconnected could unnecessarily provide power after the location registration process is concluded or abort the location registration process if that process has not concluded.

Furthermore, independent claims 1, 6, 9, and 10 provide for the powering off of the sub controller if the sub controller does not control external communication for a predetermined time-out period. In contrast, Cannon does not provide for a powering off of the RF communication device disclosed therein after a predetermined time period of operation in a full function mode, but rather powering down the RF communication device to a power conserving limited function mode, (abstract; page 2, lines 3-19).

Since each of claims 2-5, 7-8, and 11-12 is directly or indirectly dependent upon one of independent claims 1, 6, and 10, each of claims 2-5, 7-8, and 11-12 is allowable over Zhou in view of Farazmandnia and Cannon for the reasons recited above with respect to the allowability of independent claims 1, 6, and 10 over Zhou in view of Farazmandnia and Cannon.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, allowance of claims 1-12 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims as amended and pass this case to issue.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
EFS FILING SYSTEM
ON AUGUST 31, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



MAX MOSKOWITZ
Registration No.: 30,576
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700